

## **REMARKS**

The disclosure was originally objected to because of some informalities. Responsive to this, the abstract and the specification are respectively corrected in accordance with the Examiner's instruction and it is believed that the objection should be removed. Figure 1 is amended to correct the reference numeral "11" into -- 17 --. A replacement sheet of the Figure 1 is attached with this paper.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Lewis in view of Markwart et al. Examiner points out that Lewis shows the claimed invention except for the use of a detent ball mechanism to hold the workpiece in the polygonal recess, however, Markward et al. suggests that a driver can have such a detent ball mechanism for the purpose as claimed by applicant.

Responsive to this, claim 1 is amended by adding further limitation which is that the circular diameter of the extension is smaller than a diagonal width of the section of polygonal periphery, the limitation is clearly disclosed in every figure of the present application. The smaller extension allows the bit connected to the extension to reach deeper position. Furthermore, the material for making the connector is saved when compared with the connector disclosed by Lewis or Markwart et al. Another important and obvious difference between the claimed connector and the connector disclosed by Lewis is that the hexagonal portion 70 of Lewis is **not** a circular extension, even though Markwart et al. suggests the use of detent ball (18) mechanism together with the spring (20) is known to people in the art,

the spring (20) has to be cooperated with a circular periphery to retain the ball bearing (18). The hexagonal portion (70) does not include a circular periphery.

Markwart et al. does not provide any suggestion as to how to connect the spring (20) to a hexagonal portion (70) as disclosed by Lewis. No sufficient links are provided by either Lewis or Markwart et al. to combine the spring (20) disclosed by Markwart et al on a hexagonal portion (70) of Lewis. Therefore, Lewis or Markwart et al. cannot make obvious the claimed invention. It is believed that, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) should be removed, and the amended claim 1 should be allowable.

It is further submitted the amended claims 2 and 3 should be allowable as they are dependent upon the amended claim 1 which is believed to be allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the application is now in a condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Yao-Lin Cho".

YAO-LIN CHO

### **AMENDMENT TO THE DRAWINGS**

Figure 1 is amended to correct reference numeral “11” into -- 17 --. A replacement sheet of the Figure 1 is attached with this paper.